

X-Sender: rickb@goldeneye
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Pro Version 3.0.1 (16)
Date: Fri, 18 Jul 1997 10:42:35 -0400
To: sbuer@water.ca.gov, mnorris@water.ca.gov
From: Rick Breitenbach <rickb@water.ca.gov>
Subject: Clarification of meeting minutes
Cc: raymac@water.ca.gov, fpiccola@water.ca.gov

i was reading through the minutes for your last impact analysis meeting and would like to add to/claify some of the items. please send this out to your e-mail list for the group.

1. Each impact analysis technical appendix has a section entitled Assessment Methods. The description of tools/methodolgy etc. used to analyze changes brought about by the alternatives should be in this section. Some of the recently produced technical appendices have a description of tools, particularly modeling efforts, in the section decribing the consequences. This assessment methods information should be moved from this section to the "Assessment Methods" section.
2. While it may be true that significance criteria aren't overly useful at the programmatic level, they do provide the reader a sense of what we see as important and what needs to be given scrutiny at the next level of documentation. They should continue to be presented in the technical appendices.
3. In describing the affected environment we are attempting to give the reader: a) a perspective of what has happened over time that has led to the state of each specific resource (historical perspective); and b) a description of current conditions to be used for comparison purposes. Both descriptions cover a period of time. The historical period was provided to the teams, the current condition period was not. This later period of time was to be selected and choices documented by the teams. The period of time obviously varies between resources.